

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 93 15:10:39 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1209  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Mon, 11 Oct 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 1209

Today's Topics:

    "safe" cars for mobile VHF/UHF?  
    Motorola ad in QST? (2 msgs)  
    Newsline #842 (3 msgs)  
        re: MOTOROLA  
    Saturn and 2 meters  
    Temporary IDs

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 14:36:52 GMT  
From: munnari.oz.au!hp9000.csc.cuhk.hk!hkuxb.hku.hk!hkuxa.hku.hk!  
pckwong@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: "safe" cars for mobile VHF/UHF?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Jon W McCombie (jwm@world.std.com) wrote:

.....I've read about problems that hams have had with the  
: engine CPU in certain cars--most notably Toyotas--.....  
:  
: Take care and 73 de  
: Jon N1ILZ

-----

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 14:20:26 GMT  
From: ftpbox!mothost!lmpsbbbs!news@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Motorola ad in QST?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 7232@ke4zv.atl.ga.us, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:  
{In article <1993Oct8.164120.17669@lmpsbbs.comm.mot.com>  
burke\_br@adcae1.comm.mot.com writes:  
>In article 4636@anomaly.sbs.com, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Michael P. Deignan)  
writes:  
>In article <1993Oct7.161639.1483@lmpsbbs.comm.mot.com>,  
> burke\_br@adcae1.comm.mot.com (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:  
>{  
>|> That should have been more correctly explained as "tamering with it to  
>|> make a living/profit from it is a crime." Sorry, Bruce, WB4YUC, el  
YUCCO. . .  
>}  
>If I know that changing byte 3, bit 6, from a 0 to a 1 enables full-band  
>receive on a Motorola radio, and a local public-works department hires  
>me to modify their radios, I still fail to understand how this is a  
>"crime".  
>  
>Because you have given the customer something he hasn't paid for and  
>you are making a living from it.  
>  
>Nonsense. The customer paid for the radio, and the customer paid to  
>have it modified. The person doing the modification isn't violating  
>Motorola's copyright any more than someone who autographs a book is  
>violating the publisher's copyright. If Motorola doesn't want to sell  
>a customer something, they don't have to include it in their radio.  
>If you sell me a fan for cooling my shop, and it also can be modified  
>to make mounds of cold slaw, you don't get to come back and charge me  
>again for the fan. The modification is value added by me, or a third  
>party.  
>  
>Sorry, but for all your claims of "Its a crime! Its a crime!", I've yet  
>to see one solid, well reasoned explanation of why Motorola radios are  
>viewed somehow "different" with regard to copyright laws than other  
>instruments, such as books. You have failed to provide any  
>evidence that any modifications I would make are "criminal", since  
>clearly, copyright laws indicate that I am free to make changes to  
>a copyrighted item for my own use. Furthermore, copyright law  
>does not prohibit me from making taking my modifications and  
>publishing them for other people to use, nor does copyright law  
>prevent me from taking other people's copies and making my  
>changes, if they want me to.  
>  
>Yes copyright laws do apply when it comes to altering computer code and  
>then ytrying to make a living from it. And while we are at it -  
>every time you sing Happy Birthday, technically you owe someone a royalty

}>because that song is copyrighted! As for books, go ahead and pull a chapter out of

}>one and try to republish it with your name on it and watch what happens!

}

}No. Copyright applies if one were to make \*copies\* of the code, modified or not, and attempt to sell them, or even give them away. If you modify the \*original\* purchased copy, you are not in violation of copyright. As an example, I can buy a book, say the ARRL Operating Manual, which is copyrighted. I can then tear pages out of it in order to start a fire in my fireplace. That's not a violation of the ARRL copyright. Or I can insert additional pages in the book, remove pages from the book, or alter the contents of a page in the book. None of these actions, any of which may make the book more useful, are violations of the ARRL copyright. The same applies to computer code. Nothing in copyright law requires an end user to leave the code unmodified. The only thing copyright does is prohibit others from selling unauthorized \*copies\* of the code. That's where the "copy" in copyright comes from.

}

}Musical copyright is somewhat of a special case since each \*performance\* of the music generates a new \*copy\* of the song, however transitory.

}The courts have ruled that this does \*not\* apply to computer code since in-memory copies are an integral part of the operation of the code.

}Otherwise, every time you load your text editor, you'd be violating the publisher's copyright.

}

}Gary

}--

}Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
}Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
}534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
}Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

AHA! Someone who understands!!!

WB4YUC

-----

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 14:09:04 GMT

From: ftpbox!mothost!lmpsbbs!news@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Motorola ad in QST?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 14328@hemlock.cray.com, dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:

}In article 17669@lmpsbbs.comm.mot.com, burke\_br@adcae1.comm.mot.com (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:

}|In article 4636@anomaly.sbs.com, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Michael P. Deignan)

writes:

```
}
}|If I know that changing byte 3, bit 6, from a 0 to a 1 enables full-band
}|receive on a Motorola radio, and a local public-works department hires
}|me to modify their radios, I still fail to understand how this is a
}|"crime".
}|
}|Because you have given the customer something he hasn't paid for and
}|you are making a living from it.
}|
}|Wait a minute. If the customer has paid Michael, then they aren't getting
}|something they didn't pay for. ;^)
}|
}|You seem to be saying that Michael is "selling his brothers horse". I am
}|not convinced this is the case.
}|
}|If only Motorola can sell you something, then clearly Motorola must be the
}|owner of that something, or must be given the authority by the owner to
}|sell it.
}|
}|What that something is, in this case, is the right to transmit and receive
}|on frequencies that are blocked on the customer's radio because of the
}|software in the radio. Now it seems to me that as long as the customer
}|has a valid FCC licence for those frequencies, the customer has the right
}|to broadcast and receive on those frequencies. Motorola cannot sell a
}|right (or a privilege) which the FCC has granted.
```

This was a bad example. If a customer buys a radio minus a certain feature that would have to be paid for, then the customer finds someone who can add it by hacking the software - that's where the violation is.

Bruce, WB4YUC

```
}
}|On the other hand, it may be argued that what Motorola is selling is a
}|service. The service of modifying the radio. Now what law would grant
}|to Motorola the sole right to that service?
}|
}|Copyright law? I don't believe it!
}|Patent law? Certainly not!
}|
}|Laws governing trade secrets? Yes, only if those trade secrets had been
}|violated by the servicing party. This should cover the case where
}|someone stole the technology and sought to make a profit?
}|
}|Laws governing contracts? Yes, if the sale contract stipulated that only
}|motorola had these rights, and if such contract were held valid in
}|the state of the customer.
}|
```

}(Usually if information is public knowledge, it can't be considered a trade  
 secret.  
 }like magazine articles etc. In other words if John Q Smith, happens to have  
 figured  
 }out that he can change an address and extend the coverage how has he violated any  
 }agreement to maintain a trade secret?)  
 }  
 }  
 }  
 }|Yes copyright laws do apply when it comes to altering computer code and  
 }|then ytrying to make a living from it. And while we are at it -  
 }|every time you sing Happy Birthday, technically you owe someone a royalty  
 }|because that song is copyrighted! As for books, go ahead and pull a chapter out  
 of  
 }|one and try to republish it with your name on it and watch what happens!  
 }  
 }We are not talking about republishing or copying. We are talking about  
 }modifying a legitimately obtained copy.  
 }  
 }Even in the case where we are talking about making copies:  
 }  
 }No you cannot modify a song or a book and then publish it and make money.  
 }That would be a violation of a copyright. What you can do is start over  
 }from scratch and write your own book and sell that.  
 }  
 }(I can't believe any copyright law prohibits anyone from reading  
 }a book aloud or singing a song aloud. Of course we could get into  
 }freedom of speech issues here.)  
 }  
 }|tweaking a circuit is one thing.  
 }|  
 }|Messing with the computer code for profit is another.  
 }  
 }Why would software be more protected than hardware? Hardware can be patented  
 }and software (generally) cannot. Patents (generally) offer more protection than  
 copyrights. But even Patents do not prohibit the customer from making personal  
 modifications, or hiring whoever they please to make modifications.  
 }  
 }Does Motorola become offended if customers hire third parties to modify the  
 }hardware in their radios? Suppose they could extend the transmit range?  
 }Have they obtained something they have not paid for? What then?  
 }All they have bought from Motorola is a radio! (Unless they also bought  
 }a contract for certain services as with cell phone, where a modification  
 }of a radio might well give them access to services they have not paid for.  
 }This is another issue. I have not seen any postings that indicated that  
 }this was the source of the concern behind the QST add.)  
 }  
 }

```

}|You are the one who needs to study, you obviously don't understand what the
issue is.
}
}|We would be happy to have you enlighten us.  ;^)
}
}|There are all kinds of protected items within a radio. Proprietary IC's are one.
}|So is the computer code which makes the radio what it is. When you buy a radio
}
}|But how far can that protection extend? Can it prohibit someone else from
}|writing competitive computer code? Not by copyright! (IBM would have loved it
}|if the only software that could legally run on the IBM PC were IBM software!)
}|Can it prohibit the owner from making a modification? Not by patent.
}
}|that is driven by a microprocessor and computer code, you are not buying the code
}|and that is where many people think they know better. You are merely being
}|licenced to use it. The company still retains ownership of it. Just like
}
}|Yes contracts, leases, and licences can provide some protection. It seems
}|that perhaps the only way out of this mess is for a third party to write and
}|sell their own software designed to run on Motorola radios.  ;^) As mentioned,
}|some recent Supreme Court decisions have seen a limit on this protection,
}|like with restrictions against reverse-engineering.
}
}|going out and buying sheet music or a book.
}|
}|          ^^^^^ ^^^^^ ^^^^^
}|
}|Hmm, can a book publisher prohibit you from making notes in the margins of a
}|book you buy or sheet music? Would the Court dare go that far?
}|
}|
}|I won't be surprised at all if this ends up in the Supreme Court! (No, I don't
}|intend to be one of the litigants.  ;^)
}|
}|Bruce Burke, WB4YUC, e1 YUCCO. . .
}|
}|
}|
}|---
}|--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com
}|
}| Kilo Golf Zero India Oscar -(KG0IO)-
}|

```

```

-----

Date: 11 Oct 93 19:08:08 GMT
From: rtech!ingres!garys@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Newsline #842
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

```

In article <29c297INNds@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM (Dana

Myers ) writes:

>In article Mp2@news.Hawaii.Edu, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman)  
writes:

>

>>If a band of child molesters or a group that practices bestiality (sex  
>>with animals) wanted to place an ad in QST I would hope the ARRL would  
>>firmly say 'NO!'. Now, from what I see here on campus, the gay lifestyle means  
>>two or more men getting together and performing anal and or oral sex  
>>on each other in the men's restrooms; I won't even begin to describe the  
>>stains they leave on the walls of the toilet stalls. Whether one is a molester,  
>>'loves' animals or is gay it still means subscribing to a deviant and nauseating  
>>behavior. Many states still have anti-sodomy laws on the books; why should  
>>QST or any other magazine be forced to advertise a special interest group  
>>who's actions clearly violate the law's of a state in which the magazine is  
>>being sold?

>

>Ahem. If your only exposure to the "gay lifestyle" happens to be in the  
>men's restrooms at your school, then I'd suggest you need to withhold blanket  
>judgement until you have a little more perspective.

>

>To begin with, equating homosexual conduct with child molestation shows a  
>limited mindset. Child molestation victimizes a child; consensual sex  
>between adults victimizes no one.

I think what was being said is that homosexual conduct is just another form of  
deviant sexual behavior... I would add - it also continues to bring down our  
country's values to a new low...

-gary

>

>There are certainly examples of militant and public homosexual behavior that  
>are offensive. At the same time, there are many examples of militant and  
>public heterosexual behavior that are offensive. In each case, different  
>people may be offended for different reasons, but it remains that extremes  
>among all demographic groups exist.

>

>Would it make any difference to you, Jeff, if the stains on the walls of the  
>toilet stalls were there because of heterosexual conduct? Would you be less  
>critical? Heterosexual couples often engage in oral and anal sex, contrary to  
>the laws of many states. I'd even wager a significant number of ARRL members,  
>even the coded ones, enjoy sexual practices which violate anti-sodomy laws.  
>Does this mean the ARRL should be outlawed, or that the ARRL needs to extract  
>some kind of pledge from members that they will not engage in any kind of  
>"deviant" sexual behavior?

>

>Keep in mind, I am an openly heterosexual man who simply believes people  
>should be left alone when it comes to consensual sexual relations.

>  
>---  
> \* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are  
\*  
> \* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily  
\*  
> \* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
> \* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: 11 Oct 93 20:46:03 GMT  
From: ogicse!flop.ENGR.ORST.EDU!gaia.ucs.orst.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
jfh@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Newsline #842  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

garys@Ingres.COM (Gary Swiger) wrote:

>I think it's a sad day for Amateur Radio when any special interest group tries  
>to use Amateur Radio as a platform to promote their ideals - this is not the  
>purpose of Amateur Radio...

All Lamda wanted to do was to take out an ad. Do you object to QST running  
ads by the Jewish amateur radio group?

--

-----  
Jack Hamilton                      POB 281107 SF CA 94128 USA  
jfh@netcom.com                    kd6ttl@w6pw.#nocal.ca.us.na

-----  
Date: 11 Oct 93 20:48:14 GMT  
From: ogicse!flop.ENGR.ORST.EDU!gaia.ucs.orst.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
grady@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Newsline #842  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Gary Swiger (garys@Ingres.COM) wrote:

: I think it's a sad day for Amateur Radio when any special interest group tries  
: to use Amateur Radio as a platform to promote their ideals - this is not the  
: purpose of Amateur Radio...

It seems to me that the ARRL is going out of its way to pillory



the Lambda organization: the ARRL is promoting \*their\* social ideal at the expense of a social minority and the radio hobby. Does the ARRL disallow ads with the letter "VFW" in it? How about "senior citizens", "NRA", "women", or "handicapped"? No? Why not? Why do they discriminate against gays?

I think the ARRL should get out of the social commentary business and run the Lambda ads, just like they run any ads for prospective special interest radio nets. The sole criterion should be, as long as its legal and non-libelling, "Does it advance the radio hobby?"

Until then, Lambda ought to wield as big a stick as they need to get attention of the mule as dense as the ARRL OF's.

--

"PGP," warns Dorothy Denning, a Georgetown University professor who has worked closely with the National Security Agency, "could potentially become a widespread problem." -- (E. Dexheimer)  
Grady Ward grady@netcom.com (707) 826-7715 [voice/24 hr FAX]

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 14:13:16 GMT  
From: ftpbox!mothost!lmpsbbs!news@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: re: MOTOROLA  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 25429@news.uiowa.edu, mau@herky.cs.uiowa.edu (Napoleon Mau) writes:  
{From article <johng-081093164343@sce16.comm.mot.com>, by johng@ecs.comm.mot.com (John Gilbert):  
{> So does this mean that you feel it is alright to modify those files on my  
{> IBM mainframe that tell the operating system that I have paid the yearly  
{> license fee?  
{>  
{> Or I wonder if the guy posting from DEC the other day would mind if I  
{> modify the login program on my Decstation to allow more than two  
{> simultaneous users without paying DEC for the privilage? Once I make the  
{> modifications, I am sure DEC wouldn't mind if I post if to the Internet.  
{>  
{  
{It is your software. You bought it you can do what ever you want with it.  
{If the license agreement with DEC says that you are not allowed to modify  
{the OS to increase the number of users then doing so will be illegal.

Wrong, you don't own it. DEC owns it, you are only licensed to USE it!  
{  
{I assume that when you bought the IBM software you bought a 1 year site license

```

}so after a year it is illegal to use the software regardless of the
}modifications you made.
}
}When you buy a Motorola radio
}are you buying the radio not a license to use a number of the radio's features.
}
}> Nobody is going to write new Motorola radio software from scratch. There
}> is no way that they would make enough money from it to recoup their
}> Engineering investment. As for doing it as a home project --Find a team of
}> 100 software engineers who want to spend their personal time behind a work
}> station for a year. I won't be volunteering for that assignment.
}>
}Motorola did not pay millions of dollars to write the software. They went to
}the local Radio shack and they bought a DPS and a D/A chips. then they
}took the chips and put them in the radio. Then they bought a book from the
}local bookstore about signal processing algorithms, and they implemented
}these algorithms.
}
}They hired 2 engineers, propably EE grad students, and they pay them
}$4.65/hour to write the code. It took these 2 people a few months to do
}the work.
}
}In any case you do not need 100 people working for a year to implement the
}features people will pay lots of money to get.

```

Phuleeze, get real...

```

}
}
}> Motorola doesn't have a problem with business radio equipment being used in
}> the ham bands or with hardware field modifications to the equipment. The
}> problem is people hacking software to turn on features which Motorola paid
}> to write, but that the customer hasn't paid to use.
}
}If Motorola includes in the radio a piece of paper that says, "by opening this
}package you agree not to modify this radio in any way" then it will be illegal
}to do so. If Motorola does not include it then it is very legal, or it should
}be, to modify the radio.
}

```

It's included both in writing and imbedded in the code - in plain english!

WB4YUC

```

}
}> I have seen cases
}> where the software interactions from having several features turned on that
}> were never designed to be used together caused equipment or system
}> problems. Not to mention that changing codeplug bits in a radio is a good
}> way to wind up with a radio that will only power up and display the error

```

```

}> "FAIL 01/82" (corrupt radio EEPROM).
}> --
}> John Gilbert      johng@ecs.comm.mot.com      Motorola SmartZone Trunked
}> Systems
}
}Most equipment I used include labels of the form, "if you break this shield
}the warrantte is voided." Motorola can include a label that says "if any
}modifications are done on the radio the warrantte is voided."
}
}In the old days of single sided floppy disks, people used to cut a hole on the
}side of the disk to use it as a double sided disk. I have heard of computer
}companies buying 25 Mhz CPUs and using them as 33 Mhz.
}People modify car engines all the time to make them more powerfull.
}
}And of course we must not forget that if it was not for people who
}reversed engineered Intel CPUs a 8088 PC compatible would still cost $3000
}and a math coprocessor would still cost $900 instead of $89.
}
}If Motorola wants people not to use it's equipment then it can do what
}INTEL does with its CPUs. Deactivate some of the hardware features of the
}device.
}Then Motorola will be able to make lots of money by selling the equivalent
}of an intel overdrive CPU to its customers and be hated like INTEL
}is. If I must only change the EEPROM to get more features out of the radio,
}then I have every right to do so and tell all my friends how to do it.
}I even have the right to sell a kit to people to do it.
}The last time I asked it was still legal to buy EEPROM chips and programmers.
}
}I think it is called the free enterprise system.
}Wellcome to the real world.
}
}Napoleon
}

```

```

-----

Date: 11 Oct 1993 09:23:08 CDT
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!maccvm.corp.mot.com!CSLE87@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Saturn and 2 meters
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

```

At the risk of truncating what could become a bandwidth-busting topic,  
let me suggest the most simple method to resolve this problem: TEST IT!

Oh yes, I left out the most relevant detail- TEST IT ON ONE OF YOUR  
TEST DRIVES BEFORE YOU BUY THE CAR!

Take your rig, mag-mount antenna, and a lighter plug power cord with you  
when you visit the dealer. Plug in the rig, start the prospective car,  
DO NOT TAKE IT OUT OF PARK or neutral & keep foot on brake, then key

the rig. If the vehicle exhibits any unusual symptoms, such as stalling or acceleration, be very careful if you decide to go any further. The next step is to put the car in gear and take your foot SLIGHTLY off the brake. Key the radio, see if you rocket forward or stall out. Step 3 is similar but on a lightly traveled roadway at multiple speeds, and should include coming to a stop and starting from a stop.

If your vehicle passes all these tests and the salesman still wants to make the sale, take the car back to the dealer and ASK THEM about their warranty when your radio is used in the vehicle. If they tell you that there is no limitation, insist that they put that statement in ink as part of your purchase agreement.

LICENSED ATTORNEYS SPEAKING AMATEUR RADIO PLEASE TAKE IT FROM HERE!

You've done the tests, so if you still like the car and the dealer, do your part to improve the economy. Obviously, if the vehicle or dealer failed any part of the above testing process, find another and restart!

----- Original Article -----

Path: schbbs!mothost!binford!att!news.bu.edu!olivea!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.

From: easu348@orion.oac.uci.edu (Andrew Schwartz Parker)

Subject: Re: Saturn and 2 meters

Nntp-Posting-Host: orion.oac.uci.edu

Message-ID: <easu348.750234965@orion.oac.uci.edu>

Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc

Lines: 21

References: <CEn8nn.EuG@world.std.com>

Date: 10 Oct 93 06:38:54 GMT

slm@world.std.com (slm) writes:

>...no, not the planet, the car :-)

>

>Just wondering if anyone out there has experience using/installing  
>2-meter equipment (or HF, for that matter), in a Saturn. After the horror  
>stories I've heard from Toyota owners, I'd like to ask around before I  
>put any equipment in my new car.

>

>Thanks!

>

>73, Sharon KC1YR

I've had my Kenwood 741 mounted in my Saturn SC2 for the past 6 months with no problems at all. It puts out 50 watts max., and I have yet to discover a problem with any of the electronic equipment that came stock or as an option in the car. Similarly, no problems on 440 either. Good luck!

--

Andrew Parker | KD6TGM | easu348@orion.oac.uci.edu

-----  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 20:01:11 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!  
metropolis.gis.iastate.edu!willmore@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Temporary IDs  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jangus@skyld.tele.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:

> I remember having some pin-head challenge my right to transmit on a repeater  
> since I have 2X3 (obviously novice) callsign. After seriously dressing him  
> down on the repeater (and risking my license in the process) I received a  
> standing ovation from several other ops that had had run-ins with this fool  
> in the past.

Now that one has the option (in the US) of keeping the same call as they upgrade,  
is this situation occurring more often? I'm a Tech- :) and I'm planning on  
upgrading quite a bit in the coming months. I also plan on keeping my 1x3 call.  
Should I expect a lot of grief from ops on the Extra segment (after I get that  
upgrade) even though I have a legal license for that band?

Cheers,  
David

--

-----  
willmore@iastate.edu | "Death before dishonor" | "Better dead than greek" |  
David Willmore | "Ever noticed how much they look like orchids? Lovely!" |  
-----

-----  
Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
Take care! 73!!  
Philips Wong

-----  
Date: 11 Oct 1993 11:17:36 -0700  
From: olivea!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@ames.arpa  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Oct7.160806.1306@lmpsbbs.comm.mot.com>,  
<CEnnsx.187@mailier.cc.fsu.edu>, <1176@auratek.COM>#

Subject : Re: New HF Rig

epacyna@auratek.COM (Edward Pacyna) writes:

>Dell is now marketing through retail stores (e.g. COMP USA), as well as Apple.

Dell is not marketing through Apple, as far as I know.

Perhaps Ed meant to say "Dell, as well as Apple, is now marketing..."

73,

Kok "don't work for Dell" Chen, AA6TY      kchen@apple.com  
Apple Computer, Inc.

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1209

\*\*\*\*\*